Final Report on the Evaluation of French Immersion Programs at Grades 3, 6 and 9 in New Brunswick

Sharon Lapkin
Merrill Swain

Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	iii
List of Appendices	viii
Acknowledgements	ix
Introduction	1
The Sample	3
Methods of Analysis	4
Test Instruments	4
Grade 3 Results	6
Grade 6 Results	9
Grade 9 Student Characteristics	12
Grade 9 Results	16
District Comparisons	20
Teacher Characteristics and Opinions	21
Conclusion	28
Footnotes	32
References	33

List of Tables

(Tables follow References on page 34)

1. Number of Immersion Classes and Students Tested at Grades 3, 6 and 9

2. IQ Scores Obtained by Students In Grade 9 Immersion Classes

3. Tests Administered to New Brunswick Classes, Spring 1983

4. Où est Nicou? (Grade 3) Scoring Categories

5. Bienvenue au Camp de la Gélinotte (Grade 6) Scoring Categories

6. À vous la parole (Grade 9) Scoring Categories

7. Grade 3 French Listening Comprehension Results

8. Grade 3 French Reading Comprehension Results

9. Grade 3 Grammatical Competence Results

10. Grade 3 Discourse Competence Results

11. Grade 3 Cloze Test Results

12. Grade 3 Strategic Competence Results

13. Grade 6 French Listening Comprehension Results

14. Grade 6 French Reading Comprehension Results

15. Grade 6 Grammatical Competence Results

16. Grade 6 Discourse Competence Results

17. Grade 6 Cloze Test Results

18. Grade 6 Sociolinguistic Competence Results

19. Grade 6 Strategic Competence Results

20. Grade 9 French Listening Comprehension Results

21. Grade 9 French Reading Comprehension Results

22. Grade 9 Grammatical Competence Results

23. Grade 9 Discourse Competence Results

24. Grade 9 Sociolinguistic Competence Results

25. Grade 9 Strategic Competence Results

26. Grade 9 Comparisons of Class Means on Speaking and Writing Tests

27. Grade 3 District Results

28. Grade 3 District Rank Orders

29. Grade 6 District Results

30. Grade 6 District Rank Orders

31. Grade 9 Early Immersion District Results

32. Grade 9 Late Immersion District Results

33. Grade 9 District Rank Orders

34. Questionnaire Returns

35. Teaching Experience (Including 1982-83)

36. Courses Taken During Teacher Certification Related to the Teaching of French (Percentage Response)

37. Teacher Satisfaction with Type of Training as Preparation for Teaching Immersion (Percentage Response)

38. Teacher Satisfaction with Amount of Training as Preparation for Teaching Immersion (Percentage Response)

39. In-Service and Summer Courses (Percentage Response)

40. Opportunities for In-Service Training (Percentage Response)

41. How Well French is Spoken by Teacher (Percentage Response)

42. Teachers with French Used as Medium of Instruction During Schooling (Percentage Response)

43. Language Mainly Used at Home by Teachers (Percentage Response)

44. Academic Ability of Immersion Students (Percentage Response)

45. Socio-Economic Level of Immersion Students in the School (Percentage Response)

46. Student Transfers from Immersion Program this Year (Percentage Response)

47. Reasons French Immersion Students Transfer out of the Immersion Program (Percentage Response)

48. Sufficient French in the Program (Percentage Response)

49. Sufficient English in the Program (Percentage Response)

50. Amount of Material Displayed that is French or French Oriented (Percentage Response)

51. How often Various School Activities Occur in French (Percentage Response)

52. Students' Use of French in School (Percentage Response)

53. Students' French Activities Outside of School (Percentage Response)

54. Influence of School Experiences on Students' Attitudes to Francophones (Percentage Response)

55. Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Immersion Program (Percentage Response)

56. Emphasis on Oral French (Percentage Response)

57. Emphasis on Grammar and Reading (Percentage Response)

58. Assessments of Basic Subject Programs and/or Materials Available in Subjects (Percentage Response)

59. Assessments of the Back-Up Resources Available (Percentage Response)

60. Satisfaction with Program in Specific Areas (Percentage Response)

61. Importance of the French Consultant (Percentage Response)

62. Support from Principal (Percentage Response)

63. Support from Non-Immersion Teachers (Percentage Response)

64. Adequacy of Remedial Facilities to Students' Needs (Percentage Response)

65. Teachers' Perceptions of Parent Satisfaction with the Program (Percentage Response)

66. Kinds of Concerns Immersion Parents Express (Percentage Response)

67. Grade 3 Teacher Responses to Homework in the Early Grades (Percentage Response)

List of Appendices

1. Final Report on the Development of French Language Evaluation Units for Saskatchewan

2. Annotated List of French Tests

3. Second Language Student Survey (Grade 9)

4. French Immersion Teacher Survey

Acknowledgements

It would not have been possible to conduct this large-scale study in New Brunswick working from Ontario without the help and cooperation of many people. Department of Education personnel facilitated our work at every stage. Mr. Ronald Elliott, Evaluation Director, was particularly helpful in conducting liaison activities with participating schools and providing information on educational programs and school district organization in New Brunswick.

We would like to thank Aurela Michaud and Dora Martin who assisted in administering tests in Moncton and Fredericton, as well as all participating school personnel. We would also like to acknowledge the contribution of an energetic and committed team of research officers. Diane Boucher did much of the testing in New Brunswick, while at OISE Doug Hart, Jill Kamin and Laurette Lévy were responsible for the day-to-day operation of the project. Additional help was provided by Suzanne Bertrand and Rina Skitri.

Sharon Lapkin
Merrill Swain

Introduction

In commissioning a province-wide evaluation of French immersion programs at grades 3, 6 and 9, the New Brunswick Department of Education identified three major research questions:

1. What is the French second language achievement of early immersion students at grades 3 and 6, and of early and late immersion students at grade 9?
2. Are there differences in French second language achievement within programs and among districts?
3. If there are differences within programs and among districts, can the factors contributing to the differences be identified?

The first of these questions implies a set of criteria for evaluating the second language skills of French immersion students. These skill areas include the receptive skills of listening and reading comprehension and the productive skills of speaking and writing.

In October 1983, the OISE Modern Language Centre completed a large-scale project funded by Saskatchewan Education in the area of communicative French language test development (Appendix 1). In the context of that project, an annotated list of existing French language tests was compiled (Appendix 2). Although tests of the receptive skills as well as some achievement tests measuring knowledge of French grammar are available, there was a clear gap in the area of testing French speaking and writing skills. The Saskatchewan French Language Evaluation Units were developed to help fill that gap. These test materials were designed for use at grade 3, 6 and 9 in both French immersion and French minority language schools.

Assessing speaking and writing skills involves a theoretical view of what constitutes language proficiency. The Saskatchewan tests, as well as other tests (described below) used in the New Brunswick evaluation, are based on the linguistic goals of French immersion programs which go beyond teaching the rules of French grammar to

enabling students to communicate effectively in their second language. Evaluation criteria should therefore reflect a theoretical framework of communicative competence.

Such a framework has been developed by Canale and Swain (1980; see also Canale 1983) who identify four components of communicative competence. These include grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competence -- labels which reflect the salient characteristics of each. Grammatical competence includes knowledge of vocabulary, rules of word formation, pronunciation/spelling, and sentence formation. Sociolinguistic competence reflects the degree to which specific utterances are appropriate, given the topic, the status of the participants, the purpose of the interaction and other aspects of the sociolinguistic context. Discourse competence includes the mastery of cohesion (e.g. the ability to connect discourse and text with appropriate conjunctions or adverbs) and coherence, the ability to arrange ideas in logical sequence and organize meanings effectively. Finally, strategic competence involves 'coping' strategies used by learners to avoid breakdown in communication or to enhance the effectiveness of spoken discourse or written text.

This model of communicative competence suggests that these competencies are relatively independent one from the other, and that second language learners may differ from native speakers in their relative mastery of these skills. Each task in the French Language Evaluation Units was designed to tap at least one of these areas of knowledge.

Fortunately, within New Brunswick, there is a unilingual French-speaking population in the Edmundston area, providing an excellent comparison group against which the French language skills of immersion students can be compared.

In the following sections of the report we will discuss the sample of students (and classes) involved in the study, the methods of data analysis employed, the test instruments used in the evaluation and the results. Results are presented grade by grade, and, in the case of grade 9, by program. The presentation of results is followed by a

summary of teacher characteristics and opinions as well as information from grade 9 student questionnaires which, taken together, facilitate the interpretation of results.

The Sample

All school districts having immersion programs participated in the evaluation, with the exception of district 42 (because of program differences). At each of the three grade levels, at least one-half of the classes were tested. The exact numbers, which vary somewhat for each test given, are shown on Table 1. In the case of the French speaking and writing tests, a random sample of eight students was chosen from each class, while for the group tests of listening and reading comprehension, all students in each class were tested. In selecting the samples for the speaking and writing tests, information from class list forms (grades 3 and 6) and student questionnaires (grade 9) was used to ensure that only students who had been in the early or late immersion program from the starting grade level were selected.

The grade 9 questionnaires also provided information on the educational background and occupation of parents. This was considered essential for purposes of comparing the early and late immersion program groups. As a further check on comparability, an IQ measure was administered. The results presented in Table 2 show no statistically significant difference in measured IQ between the grade 9 program groups.

One comparison class of unilingual French-speaking students from Edmundston was selected at each of the three grade levels involved. An effort was made to locate classes in which the socioeconomic characteristics of the families would be similar to those of the immersion groups tested.

Methods of Analysis

The first research question (see page 1 of this report) involves comparing test scores of immersion students with those of the Edmundston francophone comparison students. In the case of group tests of listening and reading comprehension, there are limited Canadian normative data on certain tests, while for others, there are results from selected immersion programs in Ontario. All comparisons among groups are made using analysis of variance. For the French speaking and writing tests, some data from unilingual French-speaking students in Quebec (one class at each grade level) are available. These are used to supplement data from Edmundston where only one francophone class was tested at each grade level. Test scores for the speaking and writing measures are also available from the province of Saskatchewan, and are provided in Appendix 1.

The second research question involves comparisons within programs and across districts. Tables showing the distribution of district means on all tests administered are provided. On these tables, a code is assigned to each district so that they cannot be identified; a key has been sent to Department of Education officials so that relevant information can be provided to districts as considered appropriate.

The third research question concerns interpreting any consistent differences among districts in the light of information obtained from student and teacher questionnaires.

Test Instruments

The tests used in the evaluation project are listed in Table 3. The tests of French listening and reading comprehension are described in detail in the Annotated List of Tests attached as Appendix 2. A description of the French speaking and writing tests follows.

A unique feature of the French Language Evaluation Units (Où est Nicou?, Bienvenue au Camp de la Gélinotte, and À vous la parole for grades 3, 6 and 9 respectively) is that they are theme-related and interactional. The students spend up to five class periods throughout the week of the testing engaged with the materials, and the information included in the units is intended to be stimulating and interesting to the students. In fact, all three units were developed in consultation with target-aged students. Capturing the interest of students was considered to be an important factor in making the instruments truly interactive. By providing information on a topic of interest, more authentic participation is elicited from the students using the instruments.

The grade 3 unit consists of a slide show with a soundtrack on cassette. The items include a story-retelling task, five short-answer questions, a composition starter and a cloze task. There is also a sentence repetition task with 20 sentences containing such constructions as reflexive verbs, object pronouns, prepositional phrases and impersonal constructions (il faut, il y a). All of the tasks are based on the slide show, which tells the story of a French Canadian boy visiting his cousin's school and having an adventure with a runaway guinea pig.

The grade 6 unit deals with the theme of summer camp ("Bienvenue au Camp de la Gélinotte"). The illustrated booklet which constitutes the basis of the unit depicts an imaginary camp near Prince Albert National Park in northern Saskatchewan. The booklet offers basic information about camp activities, and informs students about the National Park and some of its features. The written tasks include a short-answer exercise focussing on preposition use, a factual cloze passage related to bears in the park, a writing exercise requiring students to transform information about camp activities from point form into prose, and a short composition in which students describe from photographs a friend they met at camp. The unit has two oral tasks: re-telling a

taped story from pictures depicting a fish that got away, and a spooky campfire tale which has four students continue the story a sentence at a time, round-robin style.

The theme chosen for the grade 9 unit relates to fictitious summer employment projects for youths across Canada fifteen years and older in two francophone communities in Canada. The title "À vous la parole" was taken from a letter by a young Montrealer included in the booklet in which he claims that youths face discrimination in the job market and suggests that it is time for adults to "let us have our say" in decision-making that affects youth. The two projects relate to different interest areas. The writing tasks include a letter, a composition, an informal note addressed to peers and a technical exercise (involving transforming point-form information into expository text). The oral tasks include a group discussion (among four students) and a simulated job interview.

The tasks were developed to reflect communicative functions thought to be relevant for each age group. At grade 9, for example, we agreed that students should be able to talk to peers in an informal setting as well as conduct themselves in a relatively formal interview with an adult. Scoring categories, displayed in Table 4, 5 and 6, reflect salient aspects of grammatical, discourse, sociolinguistic and strategic competence areas.

Grade 3 Results

The scores obtained on the French listening comprehension test are presented in Table 7. The French Comprehension Test was developed for use at the end of grade 1 and was normed on a Canadian population of early immersion students who had had one and one half years in the program (Kindergarten half days and Grade 1 full days). It was administered in the New Brunswick evaluation because it was the only existing standardized instrument. There was a clear ceiling effect, however, as the New

Brunswick students' average score places them at the 97th - 98th percentile with respect to Grade 1 norms. The scores shown in Table 7 are comparable to scores obtained by grade 3 total French immersion students tested during the development of the test; these students (n=170) obtained an average score of 40.24.

Based on the data available, New Brunswick immersion students achieve as well in listening comprehension as other groups of early total French immersion students; the latter groups have had more exposure to French because of their Kindergarten year. Further, no difference is found between the Edmundston francophone students and the immersion students, both of whom obtain near-maximum scores on the test.

In the area of reading comprehension, New Brunswick students obtain an average score of 18.25, somewhat below the average for the Canadian norming population (20.19; see Table 8). The score of 18.25 places them between the 31st and 36th percentile in relation to the norming population. In view of the fact that the New Brunswick program begins later (at grade 1 rather than Kindergarten), this result in French reading comprehension is not unexpected.

Results obtained on the Où est Nicou? French speaking and writing tests are presented in Tables 9 through 12 for each area of communicative competence. Some scores obtained by immersion students do not differ statistically from those obtained by the Edmundston comparison group. However when data from unilingual French-speaking students from Quebec are added, certain additional differences appear between the immersion and francophone groups. The Edmundston francophone comparison classes will be referred to as the Edmundston group in each case, while the "Edmundston + Quebec" comparison students will be referred to as the "combined" francophone group. The results are discussed below in terms of each area of communicative competence.

Generally speaking, immersion students do not perform as well as francophone students in the area of grammatical competence. Of the six grammatical measures, only

two show no significant differences (number of incomplete sentences and number of different verbs). This pattern is almost identical to that found for immersion students in Saskatchewan (see Table 12 of Appendix 1) where the Quebec comparison group also made fewer preposition errors and performed better on pronunciation and the sentence repetition task.

On two of the three discourse measures there are no significant differences between immersion and francophone students (Table 10). In the assessment of tense sequence in the oral story retelling task, however, the global rating obtained by immersion students is significantly lower than that of Edmundston francophone students. In general, discourse skills are similar in the unilingual (francophone) and bilingual (immersion) groups, a finding which also characterized the Saskatchewan data.

Cloze test results are presented in Table 11. The cloze test serves as a global measure of proficiency, integrating aspects of grammatical and discourse competence. Although there is no significant difference between immersion and Edmundston francophone students, when Quebec data are added, the score of the immersion students is significantly lower than that of the combined comparison group. A similar finding was noted in comparing Saskatchewan students to Quebec students on the cloze test.

The final area to be assessed at grade 3 is that of strategic competence. This involves assessing the extent to which students are able to use coping strategies when faced with a communication difficulty. The results presented in Table 12 show that francophone group is more successful at employing effective coping strategies than the immersion group. This mirrors the result found in comparing Saskatchewan with Quebec groups. New Brunswick and Saskatchewan students obtain an average rating of approximately 1.2, indicating that immersion students are making use of their strategic competence at grade 3.

In summary, the French listening comprehension skills of grade 3 immersion students are comparable to those of the Edmundston students, although both groups obtain a near-maximum score on the test. On the French reading comprehension test, New Brunswick students, with somewhat less exposure to French (no Kindergarten year), perform as well as or better than approximately one-third of early immersion students on whom the test was normed. On the French speaking and writing tests, immersion students are generally at no disadvantage in relation to unilingual French-speaking students with respect to discourse skills. On grammatical and strategic measures, immersion students tend to lag behind their francophone counterparts. The overall pattern of results in New Brunswick is similar to that of the Saskatchewan findings.

Grade 6 Results

French listening comprehension results are presented in Table 13. The performance of immersion students is significantly lower than that of the Edmundston francophone comparison students. There are limited data from the Ottawa-Carleton area where grade 5 immersion students (n=134) were given this test in 1978. They obtained an average of 10.25, somewhat higher than the New Brunswick immersion average of 9.33.

In French reading comprehension (Table 14), immersion students obtain a significantly lower score than that of their Edmundston counterparts. Once again, data are available from testing grade 5 early French immersion students (n=137) in Ottawa-Carleton in 1978. The New Brunswick immersion average score of 11.50 is similar to that of the Ottawa-Carleton group who obtained an average of 11.31.

In the area of French speaking and writing skills, the grammatical competence results presented in Table 15 show that the performance of immersion students is significantly different from that of combined comparison group on four of the five

measures and from the Edmundston group on three of these. Although immersion students write compositions of equal length (as measured by the number of different verbs used), they do not use as many "sophisticated" (i.e. relatively infrequent) verbs. They make more grammatical spelling errors, and their pronunciation rating is significantly below that of francophones, as might be expected. Although immersion and Edmundston students make a similar number of preposition errors, the immersion group makes more such errors than the combined group. This pattern of results was also found in Saskatchewan (Table 7 of Appendix 1), although there was no statistical difference between immersion and Quebec groups on the "number of sophisticated verbs" measure.

The similarity between average scores obtained on the grammatical measures by New Brunswick and Saskatchewan immersion students is dramatic: almost identical results are found for both groups (see Table 7 of Appendix 1).

Grade 6 discourse competence results are presented in Table 16. On the measure "number of tasks fulfilled" (requiring students to incorporate specific points of information in their compositions), immersion students perform significantly better than the francophone groups. On the written and oral tense sequence measures, immersion students do not perform as well as one of the two francophone comparison groups. These results differ from those found in Saskatchewan (Table 8 of Appendix 1) where no significant differences were noted on any of the discourse measures.

The cloze test integrates aspects of grammatical and discourse competence. As shown in Table 17, immersion students obtain a significantly lower score than that obtained by the Edmundston and Quebec francophone students taken together. The same result was noted in the Saskatchewan evaluation between immersion and Quebec francophone students. The average of 16.9 obtained by New Brunswick immersion students approximates that of the Saskatchewan immersion and minority language students (17.5).

The ability to choose and maintain an impersonal style in the technical exercise was assessed as one aspect of sociolinguistic competence. As shown in Table 18, immersion students score significantly lower than either of the francophone comparison groups. It is interesting that the Edmundston group obtains a perfect score on this measure. The immersion average of 0.5 is similar to the score of 0.6 obtained by Saskatchewan immersion and minority francophone students (see Table 10 of Appendix I).

Table 19 presents the strategic competence results. In the group story telling task, immersion students cope as well with any communication difficulties as the francophone comparison students. New Brunswick immersion students obtain an average of 1.7, performing somewhat better than Saskatchewan students who score 1.3 on this measure (see Table 11 of Appendix I).

In summary, the French listening and reading comprehension skills of immersion students are not yet native-like, as Edmundston students score significantly better on these measures. Performance in these areas approximates that of grade 5 Ottawa-Carleton students who began immersion in Kindergarten. As far as French writing and speaking skills are concerned, New Brunswick immersion students score as well as francophone comparison groups in strategic competence, but lag behind their unilingual French-speaking peers on several aspects of grammatical and discourse competence, as well as on the measure of sociolinguistic competence. The discourse competence findings may be regarded as somewhat unusual. Immersion students outperform francophone comparison students on the "basic task fulfilment" measure, but are relatively weak in their ability to use the required sequence of tenses in both the written and oral mode.

It is interesting to consider the results of another project at OISE funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada on the development of

bilingual proficiency. Swain (1983) summarizes the results of testing grade 6 immersion students as follows:

> ...the results of a series of tests administered to grade 6 immersion students indicate that (in spite of seven years of comprehensible input in the target language) their grammatical performance is not equivalent to that of native speakers. Immersion students, however, perform similarly to native speakers on those aspects of discourse and sociolinguistic competence which do not rely heavily on grammar for their realization. (emphasis added)

Grade 9 Student Characteristics

A Second Language Student Survey (Appendix 3) was administered to all grade 9 students to obtain information on the immersion program history or background of each student, students' patterns of French language use in and out of school, and their perceptions about their French language skills. Among other things, such information should assist in interpreting results from both the early and late immersion programs and assessing the degree of similarity of the two student populations.

An analysis of questionnaire responses shows that in many areas the characteristics of students in both program types are strikingly similar. There are some areas of difference, however, and these are described and discussed below after the similarities have been documented.

The student survey was administered to 210 early immersion and 181 late immersion students. The percentage of students sharing specific characteristics is provided in brackets throughout this section, with the figure on the left representing early immersion, and the figure on the right late immersion. So, for example, when asked about the amount of time devoted to instruction in French at grade nine, 68.4% early immersion and 69.6% late immersion students replied that they spent about one-half of their time taking subjects in French. In the following section such percentages are indicated as follows (68.4/69.6). Most students (64.3/62.4) are taking two subjects in

French and some (28.1/24.9) are taking three. Almost all of the students (94.8/95.6) speak English at home most or all of the time, and most (67/62.4) never or hardly ever hear French used in their homes. Similarly, in most homes (84.2/76.7) a third language is never spoken.

Many students (47.1/40.9) indicate that they have spent at least one week in a French community. Of these, most (66.7/77.1) specify one or two weeks for their first such stay. The length of their second visit was generally four weeks or less (57.7/64.9). Otherwise, the students' use of French outside of school is minimal. Most (85.2/88.4) do not speak French regularly except in school, and almost all students (91.9/96.1) have never attended a French summer camp.

Most students (69.1/70) have no occasion to use French at home with relatives, although some (25.2/22.2) report doing so sometimes. Similarly, most (86.1/82.3) say that they never or hardly ever speak French with friends outside of school. Most students (68.4/69.6) report reading no French books that are unrelated to school work; however, 29.7% early immersion and 29.8% late immersion students report reading one to four French books per month. Fewer students (15.2/12.7) choose French movies, nor do they subscribe to French magazines (98.1/97.2).

Students were asked to rate (on a scale of one to five) the importance of French for getting a job, for travel, for meeting French-speaking people and for Canadian unity. A large majority (81/80.7) indicated that French was very important for getting a job. French was also generally thought to be important or very important for travel (76.2/69.6), for meeting francophones (66.2/65) and for Canadian unity (65/59.1). Finally, when asked to comment on the intrinsic value of knowing French (i.e. whether it was "nice to know" French) the upper two scale points ("important", "very important") were chosen by most students (76.2/75.2). The students generally do not feel the need to identify with French-speaking people: most (62.2/58) say it "doesn't matter".

The students' patterns of French language use at school are quite uniform. Most (91/86.2) report using French most or all of the time with their teachers in class. Among themselves in class French is used at least half of the time by 53.1% of early immersion students and 45.9% of late immersion students. Most remaining students (27.3/32.6) say they use French among themselves in class sometimes. Between classes, most (82.3/88.4) report using French never or hardly ever.

Generally, most students express satisfaction with the type of program they have been enrolled in. At grade 9, about half (52.6/48.3) want at least 50% of their program to be in French. Most (73.7/72.4) feel the number of subjects they are currently taking in French is about right.

There are more boys in early immersion than in the late immersion program (40/33.7). More early immersion students (41.1/30.4) report having had a 'francophone' resident in their homes at one time or another. Early immersion students identify this person as a sibling (doubtless also an immersion student) in 65% of the cases and as another relative in 21.7% of the cases. For late immersion, 33.3% of the resident 'francophones' are siblings, while 35.3% are other relatives.

The socioeconomic background of the two program groups differs in some respects. Early immersion students' parents have a somewhat higher level of education. More fathers (34.3/16.7) have university degrees, as do the mothers (24.6/17). More fathers (17.3/7.6) are professionals; more early immersion mothers (17.8/5.6) are semi-professionals. The other category in which differences appear is that of the semi-unskilled: the percentage of fathers in this category is lower for early immersion (9.4) than for late immersion (16.9), and the same holds for mothers (4.3/18).

The early immersion students assess their French language skills more positively than do late immersion students. The relevant items are listed below, and the

percentage of students choosing the response categories "with little difficulty" or "without any problem" (out of a possible five categories) is shown in brackets:

> How well do you feel that you can understand a French newspaper or magazine article? (77.2/55.8)
>
> How well do you feel that you can understand a French TV movie or news program? (55.8/32.1)
>
> If you have to use French with a stranger, how well do you feel you can make yourself understood? (79.1/56.3)

In response to the first question (dealing with newspapers) 19.5% early immersion students chose the "with some difficulty" category, while 40.9% late immersion students did so.

A second set of related questions dealt with the students' perceived degree of comfort in using French. The percentage of students choosing "4" or "5" on a five-point scale is shown below for each of four dimensions:

> "not at all comfortable ... very comfortable " (50/31.5)
>
> "not very confident ... very confident" (42.6/29.3)
>
> "not at all like myself ... like my usual self" (57.4/39.3)
>
> "not at all able to get my point across ... very able to get my point across" (73.7/59.1)

Many students (44.8/60.8) report that they never or hardly ever use French with francophones in the community; of these, more are late immersion than early immersion students. As far as the "reactive" use of French is concerned, when asked how they would respond if addressed in French by a stranger, early immersion students are more willing to answer in French than are late immersion students (94.3/84).

These findings on the patterns of French language use outside of school and on students' self-assessments of their second language skills are consistent with findings from other studies. Swain and Lapkin (1982:52) found that early immersion students

considered themselves more skilled in French than did late immersion students. Although he was not comparing early and late immersion students, Genesee (1978) also found that generally immersion students do not seek out opportunities to use French outside school. The New Brunswick findings also suggest that the use of French outside school is more reactive (Genesee's term to refer to French language use initated by others) than active; but they also show that within reactive situations, early immersion students are readier to respond in French.

Grade 9 Results

The French listening comprehension results are presented in Table 20. There is a significant difference between the late immersion and Edmundston students, in favour of the francophone group; no difference is noted between early immersion and Edmundston students. Early immersion students outperform late immersion students on this measure, based on both individual students' scores and class means.

Four early immersion classes had taken the same listening comprehension test one year earlier. An analysis eliminating these classes was conducted, to examine possible effects of familiarity with the test. The difference between early and late immersion groups was still significant when students were used as the unit of analysis, but fell just short of statistical significance ($p = .065$) when the comparison was based on class means.

Limited data are available from administering the same listening comprehension test in the Ottawa-Carleton area at grades 6 and 8, and to a small group at grade 7 in Toronto; in these instances only early immersion students were tested. The average scores for grades 6, 7 and 8 respectively were 11.11, 13.68 and 14.95. The New Brunswick immersion average of 12.10 suggests that these students are not performing as well in this area as might be expected.

In the area of French reading comprehension, there is no significant difference between early and late immersion groups. As shown in Table 21, both early and late immersion students lag behind the Edmundston francophone students. The score of 28.74 for early immersion students places them between the 34th and 36th percentile with respect to Manitoba norms, developed on the basis of testing both immersion and francophone students in that province. Late immersion students tested in New Brunswick obtain an average of 27.11, which falls between the 30th and 34th percentile in relation to the norming population. Thus both New Brunswick immersion program groups perform as well as or better than 30% of the francophone population on whom the test was normed.

Aspects of grammatical, discourse, sociolinguistic and strategic competence were measured in the A vous la parole speaking and writing tests. The results relating to grammatical competence are presented in Table 22. On all of the grammatical measures there are differences in favour of one or both of the francophone comparison groups. In two cases, late immersion students differ significantly from the Edmundston group, while early immersion do not. Late immersion students use fewer sophisticated verbs than the Edmundston group. Early immersion students also use fewer, but the difference falls just short of statistical significance ($p=.056$). Late immersion students also make significantly more grammatical spelling errors as compared with Edmundston students. Late immersion students obtain a higher pronunciation rating than early immersion students.

The pattern of results for New Brunswick early immersion students is similar to that found in the Saskatchewan study, where differences on the four grammatical measures listed in Table 22 favoured the Quebec comparison group. In terms of absolute scores, New Brunswick early immersion students appear not to perform as well in "sophistication of vocabulary" (average score 1.54) as Saskatchewan students (2.5). They

make fewer preposition errors (0.86) than the Saskatchewan group (1.1), and more grammatical spelling errors (1.97 as compared to 1.4 for Saskatchewan). The pronunciation of New Brunswick students is rated somewhat more positively (1.8) than that of the Saskatchewan group (1.5).

The discourse competence results are presented in Table 23. Early immersion students perform less well than the combined francophone group on the "basic task fulfilment" measure (requiring them to incorporate specific points of information in the technical exercise). They are also weaker than the combined francophone comparison groups on the written tense sequence measure. On the oral tense sequence measure, both francophone groups clearly have no difficulty, obtaining a perfect, or near-perfect score. Late immersion students make a significantly higher percentage of errors than the combined group on this measure.

With respect to early immersion students only at grade 9, discourse measures did not to distinguish Saskatchewan from Quebec students, although the immersion group's written tense sequence performance was significantly weaker (see Table 3 of Appendix 1).

In the area of sociolinguistic competence, the students' ability to select appropriate opening phrases for the note and the letter was measured, and the socially appropriate use of the personal pronouns tu and vous was also assessed. The scores shown in Table 24 show no significant differences between the groups except in the use of tu and vous in the letter task where both immersion groups lag behind both comparison groups. The distinction between tu and vous was problematic for Saskatchewan students too: for both the note and the letter they scored lower than the Quebec comparison group (see Table 5 of Appendix 1).

On the note and the letter openings, New Brunswick students average .53 and .94, while Saskatchewan students score .6 and .9. On the tu/vous measures, New Brunswick

students score .72 and .56 for the note and letter respectively, while Saskatchewan scores are .4 and .7.

Strategic competence was measured in the group discussion task. The results presented in Table 25 show no significant difference. Francophone students clearly have no problems in communicating in this task, while New Brunswick immersion groups score somewhat (but not significantly) lower. The New Brunswick early immersion score (1.55) is somewhat better than that obtained by Saskatchewan students (1.2); in the Saskatchewan study, immersion students scored significantly lower than their Quebec counterparts.

For purposes of comparing the early and late immersion program results, an additional analysis of variance was conducted based on class means. The results, presented in Table 26, show no significant differences between the program groups on any of the speaking and writing measures. The outcome of this comparison is similar to that noted for French reading comprehension where analyses based on class means were also non-significant. The only significant difference based on class means occurs in French listening comprehension; but when classes who had received the same test one year earlier were eliminated, the difference between the early and late immersion groups falls short of statistical significance ($p = 0.65$). When students are used as the unit of analysis — a procedure necessitated by the fact that only one class of Edmundston francophone comparison students was tested —French reading comprehension results are comparable for early and late immersion groups, while in the area of French listening comprehension, early immersion students perform better than late immersion students.

Non-statistical comparisons made between New Brunswick and Saskatchewan early immersion students on the speaking and writing tests show generally similar performance

in both provinces. Limited data from Ontario on the French listening comprehension test suggest that New Brunswick early immersion students may be weaker in this skill area.

District Comparisons

Table 27 presents the test results by district for grade 3, and Table 28 displays these data in terms of rank order on each measure. In the latter table, a rank of 1 indicates best performance (which, in some cases, means that district made the fewest errors); a rank of 8 indicates worst performance. No statistical comparisons have been made among districts, because in most cases only one class per district was tested.

An inspection of these tables reveals no clear pattern in results. Thus, for example, District C ranks first in oral tense sequence and last in written tense sequence. District C gets the largest number of ranks "1" and "2", but obtains three ranks of "7" or "8". This type of information can be used diagnostically where patterns can be discerned. Thus one might infer from District C rank orders, that students are particularly strong in speaking skills since they rank high in oral tense sequence, pronunciation, communicative strategies and on the sentence repetition task.

Grade 6 district results are presented in Tables 29 and 30. It is interesting to consider in some detail the Districts B and K to examine whether there is consistency across classes. Both grade 6 teachers have one year of teaching experience. District B obtains high rankings on five of the 13 French measures and is ranked low on only one (sophisticated verbs). District K obtains low rankings on eight measures, but is ranked high on three. In both districts, there is no obvious link among measures on which students perform well or badly.

The class in District I obtains seven low rankings and only one high rank (pronunciation). Since neither IQ scores nor the teacher questionnaire data are available, it is not possible to search for an explanation of its relatively poor performance.

Turning to grade 9, district results are presented in Table 31 for early immersion and Table 32 for late immersion classes; rank orders for both programs are displayed in Table 33. Among early immersion districts, District J is interesting because that class obtains an equal number of ranks "1" and "5". Within the area of sociolinguistic competence, this class is top-ranked for using an appropriate opening in the note and bottom-ranked on the same aspect of the letter task. The students' oral skills appear consistently strong, with high ranks obtained on pronunciation and communicative strategies.

Among the late immersion districts, District D is particularly strong, with seven rankings of "1" including the French speaking measures of pronunciation, oral tense sequence and communicative strategies.

No statistical analyses of the district data have been conducted because in most cases only one class (at each grade level) participated in the evaluation. We have tried to illustrate the type of diagnostic information that is available, so that as further specific questions about differences among districts are identified, the data gathered in the evaluation can provide clues about the reasons for those differences.

Teacher Characteristics and Opinions

A French immersion teacher survey was developed (Appendix 4) to provide descriptive information about various aspects of the French immersion programs in New Brunswick.[1] Questions relating to teaching experience, language background of the teachers, availability of and satisfaction with program resources, and characteristics of the immersion students and their use of French were asked.

The survey was sent to the grades 3, 6 and 9 French immersion teachers of the classes participating in the evaluation.[2] Eighty percent of the questionnaires were returned; a breakdown by grade is presented in Table 34.

Table 35 summarizes the teaching experience of the respondents. From the table it can be seen that the immersion teachers have, on average, taught for 6 to 11 years with a great deal of variation among the teachers (1 year to 25 years). Although in general the grade 9 teachers have been teaching for the longest time, they have had the least experience teaching in an immersion situation. The questionnaire responses indicate that the teachers have taught in a number of different programs (French mother tongue, core French, French immersion and intensive French, regular program, and English to immersion students).

Table 36 shows the percentage of teachers who took courses related to the teaching of French during their teacher certification and Tables 37 and 38 deal with their satisfaction with the training as preparation for teaching in the French immersion program. As displayed in Table 36, 62% of the grade 3 immersion teachers have taken courses related to French immersion teaching during their teacher training. This is in contrast to the small percentage of grade 6 and grade 9 teachers who have taken French immersion courses. In general, (Tables 37 and 38) the grade 3 teachers are also more satisfied with their teacher training as preparation for teaching immersion.

Table 39 presents information on in-service or summer courses that have been taken by the teachers since their teacher certification. The majority of the grade 3 teachers have taken at least one course in French immersion techniques and 67% of the grade nine teachers have taken one or more courses in French as a second language. The detailed responses (not shown on the table) suggest that the teachers have found these courses to be valuable: 78% of the teachers who have taken courses in French language arts (reading) and 75% of the teachers who have taken a course in French as a second language respond that these courses were "useful" or "very useful". Of the teachers who have taken courses in French immersion techniques, 91% have found these courses to be "useful" or "very useful".

Table 40 shows that, overall, the teachers feel that there are adequate possibilities for in-service training. Some of the teachers who responded negatively to this question would like courses in written French, techniques for teaching reading, science and social sciences to immersion students.

Tables 41, 42 and 43 present data on the language background of the immersion teachers. Ninety percent of the grade 9 teachers, and 69% and 67% of the grades 3 and 6 teachers respectively are native speakers of French. Almost all of the teachers received their education in French, and 50% of the grade 6 teachers, 62% of the grade 3 teachers and 73% of the grade 9 teachers use mainly French at home.

Tables 44 and 45 present the teacher's opinions about their students' backgrounds. The majority of the teachers consider their students to be of average academic ability. The socio-economic level of the students in our sample is reported as quite variable, with the largest percentage of teachers reporting that the students have a middle class background.

Tables 46 and 47 show the number of students who will probably transfer out of immersion in the 1982-83 school year and the teachers' opinions of the reasons transfers out of immersion occur. The greatest number of expected transfers occurs at grade 9. Across all grades, teachers report that family moves and diagnosed learning disabilities account for the highest percentage of transfers.

The percentage of the curriculum taught in French for each class has been obtained from class list forms completed by the schools and from information provided by the Department of Education. At grade 3, 100% of the curriculum is taught in French in 76% of the classes. One class receives 80% of its instruction in French and the remaining classes have more than 80% of their instructional time in French. At grade 6, the classes vary in the amount of instructional time in French with a range of 50% to 80%. Forty percent of the classes are instructed in French for 50% of the time, and 47%

of the classes have 80% to 85% of their instructional time in French. At grade 9 the amount of instructional time in French varies between 17% (one class only) and 70%, with 65% of the classes having 30% of their instructional time in French and 24% of the classes being taught in French for 40-50% of the time.

Tables 48 and 49 show teacher satisfaction with the amount of French and English in the program. The majority of the teachers at all three grade levels are satisfied with the amount of French in the program, although at the grade 9 level, close to half do not feel that there is sufficient French in the program. Almost every teacher who responded to this questionnaire indicates that there is sufficient English in the program.

Teachers were asked in the questionnaire how much of the material displayed (posters, student work etc.) is French or French oriented (Table 50) and how often various school activities take place in French (Table 51). As can be seen in these tables, most teachers indicate that at least half of the material displayed in their classroom is French. At least one half of the material displayed in the school corridors is in French according to the grades 3 and 6 teachers, but not in the schools with the grade 9 classes. Very few school activities outside of the classroom take place in French, although 31% of the grade 3 teachers respond that school acitivities such as sports days occur in French at least half of the time. The majority of the grade 3 teachers, however, report that these activities never take place in French.

Table 52 presents the teachers' impressions about the use of French by their students across grades. Almost all teachers report that students communicate with them in French "often" or "always". About half of the teachers indicate that students use French most of the time with their classmates in class. Outside the classroom, the responses show that the amount of French used by the students decreases significantly. When the teachers were asked whether students should be using more French in school, 83% responded affirmatively.

A question in the survey asked teachers how much they think their students take advantage of French activities (movies, magazines, TV etc.) outside of school. Table 53 shows their responses. The responses show that there is variation from student to student but that in grade 3 and 9 about one half of the teachers report that their students do take advantage to a small degree of French activities outside the school. Virtually no teacher (except 8% in grade 3) feels that the students use French a great deal outside of the school context.

Asked whether they think that their students' school experiences have influenced their attitudes to francophones, a clear majority at all three grade levels responded "yes, positively". Not one teacher feels that their students have been negatively affected. These data are presented in Table 54. Some examples of the comments made by teachers are: "they respect the other's language", "they are proud to be called bilingual", "they are not surprised to hear French spoken in the street", "they're pleased when they have an opportunity to use their French outside of school".

The remaining questions relate largely to teacher satisfaction with the program and its resources. Table 55 presents the degree of teacher satisfaction with various aspects of the program. In general, the teachers seem quite satisfied with the program. In particular, they are satisfied with the development of competence in French, communications with the home and the reporting of student progress. They are, however, somewhat unsatisfied with opportunities for individual attention related to a child's needs or interests and opportunities for encouragement of use of French beyond the school.

Tables 56 and 57 show teachers' opinions about whether more oral French and more grammar and reading should be taught. Generally, teachers at all grade levels and particularly at grade 9 (87%) would like to see more emphasis placed on conversation and oral conversation. Fewer teachers indicate that grammar and reading needed more

emphasis, although 46% of the grade 3 teachers and 47% of the grade 9 teachers responded "yes" or "probably".

Table 58 presents teachers' assessments of basic subject programs and/or materials available in subjects. They generally express satisfaction with the French language arts program and mathematics and materials available for these subjects. While grade 3 teachers are quite satisfied with material available for science and social science, grade 6 teachers are less so. A general lack of materials is a problem that is emphasized by the teachers in several questions on the questionnaire.

Table 59 shows teacher assessments of the back-up resources available. For the most part, teachers find the availability of films and filmstrips and radio and TV broadcasts inadequate. Table 60 relates to teacher satisfaction with course content, instructions materials, teaching methods, testing and units of study. Most teachers express satisfaction with the program in these areas.

The teachers were asked whether there is a French consultant or coordinator in the District. A total of 98% of the teachers indicated that they do have a consultant or coordinator. On average, the grade 3 teachers receive 2 visits from their consultant per year (range: 0-10), the grade 6 teachers are visited 3 times per year on average (range: 0-10) and the consultants see the grade 9 classes an average of 7 times per year (range 0 to "too many to count". Table 61 shows that the teachers feel that a consultant is regarded as very important.

The job of the consultant, as described by the teachers, is to supervise the program, assure the continuity of the program, establish the program of study, obtain materials, organize meetings and offer assistance and advice to the teachers. The comments made by the teachers about their consultants were overwhelmingly positive and appreciative (" ... 100% effective", "she is very effective ... she's there to help us and she does an excellent job").

Table 62 shows the teacher responses to the question "How strongly do you feel your principal backs immersion programs?" There is considerable variation in the teachers' responses, with almost none reporting "no support". When the teachers were asked what the principal could do to improve the immersion program, the majority commented that he or she could learn French or try to speak French with the students.

Table 63 presents the responses to the question "How supportive would you say non-immersion teachers in your school are of immersion programs?" The data suggest that the grade 3 teachers get the most support from their non-immersion colleagues. About one-third of the grade 9 teachers feel that their colleagues are unsupportive.

Teachers were asked who (classroom teacher, another classroom teacher, special teacher) teaches the various school subjects, and in what language, and whether they were satisfied with this arrangement. The majority of the teachers (69% in grade 3, 83% in grade 6 and 87% in grade 9) found the current arrangements satisfactory.

A question relating to the availability of remedial teachers was included in the questionnaire. At grade 3, one teacher reports that she has a special consultant for oral French, one teacher indicates that she uses student volunteers to assist with French reading, and five teachers (38%) write that other teachers help out during their free periods. At grade 6, one teacher has a consultant for oral French and reading, one teacher has a resource teacher for mathematics and science in English, and four teachers (33%) report that they themselves offer remedial help in the various subject areas. Most of the grade 9 teachers (67%) indicate that teachers teaching the particular subjects provide assistance to students who need help.

Table 64 shows teachers' responses to the question "Are these facilities adequate to your students' needs?" The grade 3 teachers who answered in the negative (54%) commented that there was a need for remedial specialists. Grade 6 teachers appear better satisfied with existing remedial facilities than either grade 3 or grade 9 teachers.

The teachers were asked about parental satisfaction with the immersion program. As shown in Table 65, teachers perceive a high level of parental satisfaction. When asked about the kinds of concerns immersion parents express, the overwhelming response relates to parents' inability to help their children with homework (Table 66). The issue of homework was explored in greater depth by an additional questionnaire item presented in Table 67. The grade 3 teachers generally feel that students in the early grades have sufficient knowledge of French to handle homework.

The overall impression revealed in the analysis of the teacher questionnaire is generally one of satisfaction with the program. When the teachers were asked to identify the weakest aspects of the program, recurring responses included a lack of materials, a lack of remedial specialists and resource people, insufficient library books and inadequate opportunities for students to speak French. When asked about the greatest success of the program, teachers mentioned students' pride in speaking French and being bilingual, students' success in high school, the students' ability to communicate in French, the cooperation and competence of the immersion teacher, parental satisfaction and the positive attitudes of the parents, students and teachers.

Conclusion

The major focus of the province-wide evaluation of French immersion programs in New Brunswick involved assessing the French language skills of early immersion students at grades 3 and 6, and of early and late immersion groups at grade 9. The criteria by which these skills were assessed were established in reference to the following comparison groups:

1. Within New Brunswick, the performance of immersion students was compared with that of a small number of Edmundston francophone students.

2. In order to have more francophone data, scores obtained from testing a small number of Quebec francophone students were also used.
3. Where possible, standardized French tests with Canadian norms were employed.
4. In the area of French speaking and writing skills, reference was made to the results of province-wide testing of early immersion students in Saskatchewan which also took place in the spring of 1983.

Results for each grade level will be summarized briefly below, with particular attention to any differences between the early and late immersion program at grade 9.

At grade 3, there was no suitable existing test of French listening comprehension. Immersion students performed just as well as the Edmundston comparison students, but both groups scored close to the maximum. In addition, New Brunswick students perform as well as other Canadian immersion students at grade 3 tested during the test development process. In reading comprehension, New Brunswick students perform as well as or better than approximately one-third of the Canadian norming population, who had an additional half year of French in Kindergarten. The French speaking and writing skills of New Brunswick immersion students are generally comparable to those obtained in Saskatchewan. Moreover, the pattern of immersion/francophone differences in scores is similar in the two provinces.

At grade 6, immersion students obtain significantly lower scores than the Edmundston comparison group in both listening and reading comprehension. Comparison data from an Ottawa-Carleton immersion group tested at grade 5 (with 5 1/2 years of French immersion) show that the performance of New Brunswick students is similar in French reading comprehension, and somewhat weaker in listening comprehension. On the French speaking and writing measures New Brunswick students obtain scores which are generally strikingly similar to those obtained by their Saskatchewan counterparts.

At grade 9, the scores of both early and late immersion students are significantly lower than those of the Edmundston comparison students in French listening and reading comprehension. Early and late immersion program groups do not differ from each other in reading comprehension, but early immersion students perform better than late immersion students in French listening comprehension.

Listening comprehension skills appear somewhat weaker than one might expect, in comparison to scores obtained by Ottawa-Carleton students tested at grade 6 through 8. The French reading comprehension test was normed on a Manitoba francophone population; New Brunswick immersion students perform as well as or better than 30% of the norming group.

The French speaking and writing skills of grade 9 early and late immersion students are strikingly similar: when the class means of these students are compared, there are no differences on any measure of speaking or writing. (The details of any differences between the early and late immersion scores based on individual students as the unit of analysis were presented in the relevant section of this report, and are not repeated here.)

With the exception of the difference in listening comprehension scores in favour of the early immersion group, no other French test scores distinguish early and late immersion performance. To infer that the early immersion program could be supplanted by the late immersion alternative would be unfortunate. Even if the listening comprehension skills of late immersion students receive greater attention in the future, it is likely that important differences will remain between the two program groups.

Evidence of differences in the outcomes of early and late French immersion programs comes from the view of students as expressed through a questionnaire designed primarily to elicit self-assessments of second-language skills and information on patterns of French language use in and out of the school context. Early immersion students consistently rate their French skills higher than do late immersion students. Moreover,

early immersion students report feeling more comfortable and confident in using French than do late immersion students. Finally, early immersion students are somewhat more willing to use French in the community, and are more likely to respond in French when addressed by a French-speaking person.

These findings appear to replicate those of other studies (cited in the body of the report). The salient advantages of the early immersion program relate to French listening skills and the perceived degree of comfort, confidence and ability in French on the part of the students. Clearly, the late immersion progam is also successful, producing students who achieve as well as their early immersion counterparts in most skill areas.

At all grade levels, it proved difficult to discern clear patterns in the differences among districts. However, the potential for examining test results in the light of information gathered through student and teacher questionnaires is enormous. As further specific questions arise pertaining to such differences, the questionnaire data can be explored for possible explanations.

Footnotes

[1] Many questions in the survey were used or adapted from a survey developed by George Burns and Paul Olson. See George Burns and Paul Olson, Implementation and Politics in French Immersion. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1981.

[2] Additional copies were mailed to the principals to be given to any teachers in the school who were teaching these students other subjects in French. In one instance only, at grade 9, questionnaires were received from two teachers teaching the same class. Both questionnaires have been included in the analyses.

References

Canale, M. From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. Richards and R. Schmidt, eds. **Language and Communication.** London: Longman Group Ltd., 1983.

Canale, M. and Swain, M. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. **Applied Linguistics,** 1(1980), 1-47.

Genesee, F. Second language learning and language attitudes. **Working Papers on Bilingualism,** 16(1978), 19-42.

Swain, M. and Lapkin, S. **Evaluating Bilingual Education: A Canadian Case Study.** Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 1982.

Swain, M. Understanding input through output. Paper presented at the Xth University of Michigan Conference on Applied Linguistics. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1983 (mimeo).

TABLES

Key to Symbols Used on Tables

A = New Brunswick immersion program group

B = Edmundston francophone comparison group

C = Edmundston and Quebec francophone comparison groups, combined

NS = non-significant

* marks a statistical difference significant at the $p \leq .05$ level

** marks a statistical difference significant at the $p \leq .01$ level

*** marks a statistical difference significant at the $p \leq .001$ level

Note: In Tables 34 through 67, missing data are reflected in cases where percentage figures do not total 100%.

Table 1

Number of Immersion Classes and Students Tested at Grades 3, 6 and 9

Grade	Program	No. of Classes[a]	No. of Students
3	Early Immersion	17	418
6	Early Immersion	15	370
9	Early Immersion	10	218
9	Late Immersion	9	192

[a] Excluding 'split grades', the total number of classes operating in 1982-83 at grade 3 is 34 and at grade 6, 27. At Grade 9, for early immersion the number is 13, while there were 12 late immersion classes. (Source: New Brunswick French Immersion Statistics 1982-83)

Table 2

IQ Scores Obtained by Students in Grade 9 Immersion Classes

Early Immersion			Late Immersion			Analysis of Variance	
$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	F-ratio	Significance
111.19	13.91	196	109.04	13.31	186	2.368	NS

Table 3

Tests Administered to New Brunswick Classes, Spring 1983

Tests	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
IQ test[a]	Canadian Cognitive Abilities Test (CCAT) group test	Canadian Cognitive Abilities Test (CCAT) group test	Canadian Cognitive Abilities Test (CCAT) group test
French Listening Comprehension	OISE French Comprehension Test, Level 1 group test	Test de compréhension auditive (TCA), Level A group test	TCA, Level B group test
French Reading Comprehension	OISE Test de lecture, Level 3[a] group test	Test de comprehénsion de l'écrit (TCE), Level A group test	Test de lecture silencieuse group test
French Speaking and Writing ('Saskatchewan' tests)	Où est Nicou? sample of 8 students per class	Bienvenue au Camp de la Gélinotte sample of 8 students per class	A vous la parole sample of 8 students per class
Student Survey			Second Language Student Survey[a] group

[a]These tests were not administered in Edmundston.

Table 4

Où est Nicou? (Grade 3) Scoring Categories

		GRAMMATICAL COMPETENCE		DISCOURSE COMPETENCE	STRATEGIC COMPETENCE
		Vocabulary items	Rules of grammar and pronunciation		
WRITTEN	Question & answer		-incomplete sentences (count) -use of prepositions (error count)		
	Composition	-variety of vocabulary (verb count) -sophistication of vocabulary (verb count)		-basic task fulfilment (check list) -tense sequence (error count)	
	Cloze test	-overall language proficiency (exact-response scoring)			
ORAL	Story retelling		-pronunciation (4-point scale)	-tense sequence (error count)	-communicative strategies (3-point scale)
	Sentence repetition		-prepositions, pronouns, "être" & "avoir", and impersonal expressions (exact-response scoring)		

Table 5

Bienvenue au Camp de la Gélinotte (Grade 6) Scoring Categories

		GRAMMATICAL COMPETENCE		SOCIOLINGUISTIC COMPETENCE	DISCOURSE COMPETENCE	STRATEGIC COMPETENCE
		Vocabulary items	Rules of grammar and pronunciation			
WRITTEN	Sentence writing		- use of prepositions (error count)			
	Technical exercise		- word formation and grammatical spelling ("oral" error count)	- appropriateness of style (2-point scale)		
	Composition	- variety of vocabulary (verb count) - sophistication of vocabulary (verb count)			- basic task fulfilment (check list) - tense sequence (error count)	
	Cloze test	- overall language proficiency (exact response scoring)				
ORAL	Individual story retelling		- pronunciation (4-point scale)		- tense sequence (error count)	
	Group story telling					- communicative strategies (3-point scale)

Table 6

À Vous la parole (Grade 9) Scoring Categories

		GRAMMATICAL COMPETENCE		SOCIOLINGUISTIC COMPETENCE	DISCOURSE COMPETENCE	STRATEGIC COMPETENCE
		Vocabulary items	Rules of grammar and pronunciation			
WRITTEN	Composition	- sophistication of vocabulary (verb count)	- use of prepositions (error count)		- tense sequence (error count)	
	Technical exercise		- word formation & grammatical spelling ("oral" error count)			
	Note			- appropriateness of style (check list)	- basic task fulfilment (check list)	
	Letter			- appropriateness of style (check list)		
ORAL	Group discussion					- communicative strategies (3-point scale)
	Interview		- pronunciation (4-point scale)			

Table 7

Grade 3 French Listening Comprehension Results

French Comprehension Test, Level 1 (max = 45)	Immersion Students			Edmundston Students			Analysis of Variance	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	F-ratio	Significance
	39.27	3.84	402	39.62	4.34	21	0.159	NS

Table 8

Grade 3 French Reading Comprehension Results

Test de lecture (max = 28)	New Brunswick			Norming Population			New Brunswick Percentile Rank
	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	
	18.25	6.30	323	20.19	5.35	708	31-36

Table 9

Grade 3 Grammatical Competence Results

Grade 3 Task	Particular Aspect Assessed	Immersion (A) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston (B) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston + Quebec (C) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Significance
1. Written											
Question and answer exercise	No. of incomplete sentences	2.07	1.51	136	2.69	1.70	16	2.38	1.54	34	NS
	No. of preposition errors	0.75	0.63	138	0.75	0.93	16	0.45	0.75	33	A>C*
Composition	No. of different verbs	6.21	2.40	138	6.69	2.21	16	6.15	2.17	33	NS
	No. of sophisticated verbs	0.26	0.61	138	1.13	1.09	16	0.94	1.0	33	A<B, C***
2. Oral											
Story retelling	Pronunciation rating (max=3)	2.12	0.45	139	3.0	0.0	17	3.0	0.0	25	A<B, C***
Sentence repetition	Accurate use of prepositions, pronouns, être and avoir, impersonal expressions (max=36)	19.69	6.50	128	26.88	5.35	16	29.33	5.65	24	A<B, C***

Table 10

Grade 3 Discourse Competence Results

Grade 3 Task	Particular Aspect Assessed	Immersion (A) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston (B) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston + Quebec (C) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Significance
1. Written Composition	No. of tasks fulfilled (max = 4)	3.50	1.11	138	3.38	1.26	16	3.53	0.95	32	NS
	Percentage of tense sequence errors	20.60	28.51	136	21.31	32.46	16	14.39	26.59	32	NS
2. Oral Story retelling	Global evaluation of tense sequence (max = 2)	1.18	0.82	137	1.76	0.56	17				A < B**

Table 11

Grade 3 Cloze Test Results

	Immersion (A) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston (B) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston + Quebec (C) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Significance
No. of exact responses (max = 21)	9.93	3.62	139	10.94	5.12	16	12.38	4.66	34	A < C**

Table 12

Grade 3 Strategic Competence Results

Grade 3 Task	Particular Aspect Assessed	Immersion (A)			Edmundston (B)			Edmundston + Quebec (C)			Significance
		$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	
Story retelling	Communicative strategies (max=2)	1.28	0.74	137	1.59	0.62	17	1.72	0.54	25	A<C**

Table 13

Grade 6 French Listening Comprehension Results

Test de compréhension auditive, Level A (max = 17)	Immersion Students[a] $\bar{X}$	N	Edmundston Students $\bar{X}$	N	Analysis of Variance F-ratio	Significance
	9.33	347	13.73	30	44.032	<.001

[a]Four of the 15 classes tested at grade 6 had been given the same listening comprehension test in 1982. Removing the scores of these students, the average obtained by the remaining students is 8.94.

Table 14

Grade 6 French Reading Comprehension Results

Test de compréhension de l'écrit, Level A (max = 20)	Immersion Students $\bar{X}$	N	Edmundston Students $\bar{X}$	N	Analysis of Variance F-ratio	Significance
	11.36	355	13.90	30	11.850	<.001

Table 15

Grade 6 Grammatical Competence Results

Grade 6 Task	Particular Aspect Assessed	Immersion (A) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston (B) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston + Quebec (C) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Significance
1. Written											
Sentence writing	No. of preposition errors	2.57	1.56	122	2.50	1.41	8	1.69	1.35	26	A > C**
Technical exercise	No. of grammatical spelling errors	1.21	1.09	120	0.13	0.35	8	0.15	0.46	26	A > B** A > C***
Composition	No. of different verbs	9.06	2.84	121	10.13	5.33	8	8.76	3.88	25	NS
	No. of sophisticated verbs	0.82	0.97	121	2.0	2.62	8	1.32	1.68	25	A < B** A < C*
2. Oral											
Individual story retelling	Pronunciation rating (max=3)	1.88	0.38	120	3.0	0.0	8	3.0	0.0	14	A < B, C***

Table 16

Grade 6 Discourse Competence Results

Grade 6 Task	Particular Aspect Assessed	Immersion (A) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston (B) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston + Quebec (C) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Significance
1. Written											
Composition	No. of tasks fulfilled (max = 5)	4.21	0.83	121	3.50	1.07	8	3.72	0.94	25	A>B* A>C**
	Percentage of tense sequence errors	4.68	7.03	120	1.25	3.54	8	1.42	3.97	25	A>C*
2. Oral											
Individual story retelling	Percentage of tense sequence errors	20.50	17.65	120	6.93	7.70	8	11.72	16.76	14	A>B*

Table 17

Grade 6 Cloze Test Results

	Immersion (A) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston (B) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston + Quebec (C) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Significance
No. of exact responses (max = 42)	16.93	5.02	122	20.50	7.39	8	25.56	6.17	25	A<C***

Table 18

Grade 6 Sociolinguistic Competence Results

Grade 6 Task	Particular Aspect Assessed	Immersion (A)			Edmundston (B)			Edmundston + Quebec (C)			Significance
		$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	
Technical exercise	Appropriateness of style (max = 1)	0.51	0.50	120	1.0	0.0	8	0.77	0.43	26	A<B** A<C*

Table 19

Grade 6 Strategic Competence Results

Grade 6 Task	Particular Aspect Assessed	Immersion (A)			Edmundston (B)			Edmundston + Quebec (C)			Significance
		$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	
Group story telling	Communicative strategies (max = 2)	1.65	0.48	80	1.88	0.35	8	1.86	0.36	14	NS

Table 20

Grade 9 French Listening Comprehension Results

Test de compréhension auditive, level B (max = 22)	Early Immersion (A1)[a]			Late Immersion (A2)			Edmundston (B)			Significance
	X	SD	N	X	SD	N	X	SD	N	
Based on individual students	12.52	3.53	208	10.13	3.07	176	13.73	3.88	22	A1 > A2***
										A2 < B***
Based on class means	12.18	1.93	10	10.28	1.18	9	-	-	-	A1 > A2*

[a]Two of the 10 early immersion classes tested at grade 9 had been given the same listening comprehension test in 1982. Removing the scores of these students, the average obtained by the remaining students is 12.10

Table 21

Grade 9 French Reading Comprehension Results

Test de lecture silencieuse (max = 58)	Early Immersion (A1)			Late Immersion (A2)			Edmundston (B)			Significance
	X	SD	N	X	SD	N	X	SD	N	
Based on individual students	28.74	9.61	202	27.11	8.42	176	33.36	10.28	22	A1 < B*
										A2 < B**
Based on class means	28.72	3.98	10	26.78	3.74	9	-	-	-	NS

Table 22

Grade 9 Grammatical Competence Results

Particular Aspect Assessed[a]	Early Immersion (A1) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Late Immersion (A2) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston (B) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston + Quebec (C) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Significance
1. Written													
Number of sophisticated verbs	1.54	2.52	70	1.23	1.36	62	3.38	2.62	8	5.04	3.04	23	A1,A2 < C*** A2 < B***
Number of preposition errors	0.86	1.06	69	0.69	1.21	62	0.25	0.46	8	0.13	0.34	23	A1 > C** A2 > C*
Number of grammatical spelling errors	1.97	1.86	70	2.39	2.12	67	0.88	1.13	8	0.39	0.78	23	A2 > B* A1,A2 > C***
2. Oral													
Pronunciation rating: interview (max = 3)	1.80	0.56	69	2.06	0.50	64	3.0	0.0	8	3.0	0.0	15	A1 < A2** A1,A2 < B,C***

[a]The first two measures listed apply to the composition task, while grammatical spelling errors were assessed in the technical exercise.

Table 23

Grade 9 Discourse Competence Results

Particular Aspect Assessed[a]	Early Immersion (A1) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Late Immersion (A2) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston (B) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston + Quebec (C) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Significance
1. Written													
Number of tasks fulfilled (max = 5)	3.47	1.22	68	3.65	1.11	63	3.86	0.90	7	4.05	0.72	22	A1<C*
Percentage of tense sequence errors	11.62	14.05	74	9.55	15.93	66	5.0	7.56	8	5.22	7.31	23	A1>C*
2. Oral													
Percentage of tense sequence errors	9.59	21.01	51	11.87	18.88	39	0.0	0.0	6	0.15	0.55	13	A2>C*[b]

[a] "Basic task fulfilment" was measured in the note task, while tense sequence errors were assessed in the composition (written) and interview (oral).

[b] The score of both francophone groups (B and C) is perfect or almost perfect, yet few statistical differences appear. This can be explained by the high standard deviations of the immersion groups' scores; the statistical test is based on the assumption that variances are equal.

Table 24

Grade 9 Sociolinguistic Competence Results

Particular Aspect Assessed[a]	Early Immersion (A1) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Late Immersion (A2) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston (B) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston + Quebec (C) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Significance
Note opening	0.53	0.50	68	0.41	0.50	63	0.29	0.49	7	0.64	0.49	22	NS
Note tu/vous	0.72	0.45	68	0.68	0.47	63	0.57	0.53	7	0.68	0.48	22	NS
Letter opening	0.94	0.23	71	0.93	0.26	67	1.0	0.0	8	0.87	0.34	23	NS
Letter tu/vous	0.56	0.50	71	0.43	0.50	67	1.0	0.0	8	1.0	0.0	23	A1 < B* A2 < B** A1, A2 < C***

[a]The maximum score for each of the four measures is 1.0

Table 25

Grade 9 Strategic Competence Results

	Early Immersion (A1) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Late Immersion (A2) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston (B) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Edmundston + Quebec (C) $\bar{X}$	SD	N	Significance
Communication strategies: group discussion exercise (max = 2)	1.55	0.78	67	1.58	0.70	52	2.0	0.0	4	1.92	0.29	12	NS

Table 26

Grade 9 Comparisons of Class Means on Speaking and Writing Tests

Aspect Evaluated	Early Immersion			Late Immersion			Analysis of Variance	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	F-ratio	Significance
1. GRAMMATICAL								
No. of sophisticated verbs	1.63	1.35	10	1.05	0.58	9	1.407	NS
No. of preposition errors	0.83	0.57	10	0.66	0.55	9	0.438	NS
No. of grammatical spelling errors	2.00	1.13	10	2.42	0.61	9	0.983	NS
Pronunciation (max=3)	1.86	0.38	10	1.93	0.29	9	0.185	NS
2. DISCOURSE								
No. of tasks fulfilled (max=5)	3.50	0.38	10	3.65	0.47	9	0.630	NS
Percentage of tense inconsistencies (composition)	11.91.	5.89	10	8.75	6.20	9	1.298	NS
Percentage of tense inconsistencies (interview)	8.99	8.85	9	11.51	7.52	9	0.422	NS
3. SOCIOLINGUISTIC								
Note opening	0.49	0.24	10	0.48	0.17	9	0.009	NS
Note tu/vous	0.73	0.19	10	0.69	0.20	9	0.178	NS
Letter opening	0.95	0.11	10	0.92	0.10	9	0.398	NS
Letter tu/vous	0.52	0.19	10	0.48	0.20	9	0.193	NS
4. STRATEGIC								
Use of communicative strategies (max=2)	1.63	0.28	10	1.48	0.22	9	1.639	NS

Table 27

Grade 3 District Results (based on class means)

Measure	District B		C		G		H		I		J		K		L		All	
	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N
IQ	108.88	1	103.00	1	97.12	5	102.09	5	-	-	101.89	1	94.78	1	97.80	2	100.01	16
Listening (max=45)	40.09	1	41.17	1	39.20	5	39.36	5	39.91	1	40.15	1	37.27	1	38.76	2	39.35	17
Reading (max=28)	20.17	1	21.06	1	17.43	4	19.11	4	18.64	1	-	1	16.76	1	17.12	2	18.36	14
SPEAKING AND WRITING																		
No. of incomplete sentences	0.63	1	0.88	1	2.41	5	2.30	5	2.11	1	3.00	1	1.50	1	1.75	2	2.07	17
No. of preposition errors	0.75	1	0.38	1	0.82	5	0.78	5	1.00	1	1.00	1	0.38	1	0.63	2	0.75	17
No. of different verbs	6.88	1	7.00	1	5.83	5	5.43	5	6.44	1	7.25	1	7.13	1	7.19	2	6.20	17
No. of sophisticated verbs	0.25	1	0.00	1	0.31	5	0.20	5	0.22	1	0.25	1	0.13	1	0.50	2	0.26	17
Pronunciation (max=3)	2.33	1	2.63	1	1.98	5	2.15	5	1.75	1	2.13	1	2.13	1	2.19	2	2.12	17
Sentence repetition (max=36)	20.38	1	23.88	1	24.36	4	17.12	5	17.89	1	19.13	1	15.38	1	17.25	2	19.64	16
No. of tasks fulfilled (max=4)	3.88	1	3.25	1	3.79	5	3.33	5	2.78	1	3.38	1	3.38	1	3.69	2	3.51	17
% of tense errors (written)	15.76	1	40.83	1	14.06	5	20.09	5	25.56	1	26.16	1	37.17	1	17.16	2	20.62	17
Oral tense rating (max=2)	1.22	1	1.88	1	1.13	5	1.34	5	1.29	1	1.13	1	1.13	1	0.56	2	1.18	17
Cloze exact responses (max=21)	10.38	1	10.38	1	9.39	5	10.13	5	9.44	1	9.50	1	9.00	1	11.31	2	9.94	17
Communicative strategies (max=2)	0.89	1	1.63	1	1.30	5	1.30	5	1.14	1	1.13	1	1.50	1	1.31	2	1.29	17

Table 28

Grade 3 District Rank Orders[a]

	District							
Measure	B	C	G	H	I	J	K	L
IQ	1	2	6	3	-	4	7	5
Listening	3	1	6	5	4	2	8	7
Reading	2	1	5	3	4	-	7	6
Incomplete sentences	1	2	7	6	5	8	3	4
Preposition errors	4	1	6	5	7	7	1	3
Different verbs	5	4	7	8	6	1	3	2
Sophisticated verbs	3	8	2	6	5	3	7	1
Pronunciation	2	1	7	4	8	5	5	3
Sentence repetition	3	2	1	7	5	4	8	6
Tasks fulfilled	1	7	2	6	8	4	4	3
Tense errors (written)	2	8	1	4	5	6	7	3
Tense errors (oral)	4	1	5	2	3	5	5	8
Cloze exact responses	2	2	7	4	6	5	8	1
Communicative strategies	8	1	4	4	6	7	2	3

[a]1=best performance; 8=worst performance

Table 29

Grade 6 District Results (based on class means)

Measure	District B		C		G		H		I		J		K		All	
	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N
IQ	109.00	1	111.39	1	110.20	4	108.42	5	-	-	102.47	1	-	-	108.30	12
Listening (max=17)	9.76	1	9.42	1	8.15	4	8.46	6	4.79	1	9.93	1	6.94	1	9.08	15
Reading (max=20)	12.24	1	10.76	1	12.18	4	11.39	6	7.40	1	11.13	1	10.43	1	11.27	15
SPEAKING AND WRITING																
No. of preposition errors	1.63	1	2.88	1	2.35	4	2.40	6	4.22	1	2.50	1	3.38	1	2.56	15
No. of grammatical spelling errors	1.38	1	0.75	1	1.21	4	1.11	6	2.00	1	1.00	1	1.63	1	1.22	15
No. of different verbs	8.50	1	8.75	1	10.23	4	8.29	6	9.00	1	8.50	1	10.38	1	9.05	15
No. of sophisticated verbs	0.38	1	0.50	1	1.00	4	0.83	6	0.75	1	0.75	1	0.88	1	0.82	15
Pronunciation (max=3)	1.88	1	1.88	1	1.91	4	1.89	6	2.13	1	1.63	1	1.63	1	1.87	15
No. of tasks fulfilled (max=5)	4.38	1	4.13	1	4.27	4	4.13	6	4.25	1	4.38	1	4.13	1	4.21	15
% of tense errors (written)	5.26	1	2.22	1	3.98	4	4.07	6	5.96	1	4.95	1	11.79	1	4.70	15
% of tense errors (oral)	19.13	1	22.42	1	14.56	4	20.51	6	22.54	1	22.90	1	39.22	1	20.48	15
Cloze exact responses (max=42)	18.25	1	20.0	1	18.40	4	16.71	6	12.00	1	16.50	1	13.75	1	16.96	15
Appropriate style (max=1)	0.50	1	0.75	1	0.15	4	0.83	6	0.22	1	0.25	1	0.50	1	0.52	15
Communicative strategies (max=2)	2.00	1	1.63	1	-	-	1.54	6	-	-	1.63	1	2.0	1	1.65	10

Table 30

Grade 6 District Rank Orders[a]

	District						
Measure	B	C	G	H	I	J	K
IQ	3	1	2	4	-	5	-
Listening	3	4	1	5	7	2	6
Reading	1	5	2	3	7	4	6
Preposition errors	1	5	2	3	7	4	6
Grammatical spelling errors	5	1	4	3	7	2	6
Different verbs	5	4	2	7	3	5	1
Sophisticated verbs	7	6	1	3	4	4	2
Pronunciation	4	4	2	3	1	6	6
Tasks fulfilled	1	5	3	5	4	1	5
Tense errors (written)	5	1	2	3	6	4	7
Tense errors (oral)	2	4	1	3	5	6	7
Cloze exact responses	3	1	2	4	7	5	6
Appropriate style	3	2	7	1	6	5	3
Communicative strategies	1	3	-	5	-	3	1

[a]1=best performance; 7=worst performance

Table 31

Grade 9 Early Immersion District Results (based on class means)

	District											
	F		G		H		J		K		All	
Measure	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N
IQ	106.08	1	115.90	2	109.14	5	109.53	1	108.13	1	110.13	10
Listening (max=22)	13.53	1	13.43	2	12.07	5	10.76	1	10.31	1	12.18	10
Reading (max=58)	28.82	1	28.64	2	27.30	5	34.00	1	30.64	1	28.72	10
SPEAKING AND WRITING												
No. of sophisticated verbs	0.50	1	3.83	2	1.12	5	2.13	1	0.38	1	1.63	10
No. of preposition errors	0.50	1	0.45	2	0.80	5	1.88	1	1.00	1	0.83	10
No. of grammatical spelling errors	2.75	1	1.50	2	1.85	5	3.25	1	1.75	1	2.00	10
Pronunciation (max=3)	1.75	1	1.58	2	1.87	5	2.50	1	1.88	1	1.86	10
No. of tasks fulfilled (max=5)	3.25	1	3.61	2	3.50	5	3.25	1	3.75	1	3.50	10
% of tense errors (written)	13.75	1	5.27	2	10.71	5	17.50	1	23.75	1	11.91	10
% of tense errors (oral)	22.36	1	12.16	2	7.31	4	5.00	1	0.00	1	8.99	9
Note opening	0.50	1	0.78	2	0.46	5	0.00	1	0.50	1	0.49	10
Note tu/vous	1.00	1	0.62	2	0.76	5	0.63	1	0.63	1	0.73	10
Letter opening	1.00	1	1.00	2	0.90	5	1.00	1	1.00	1	0.95	10
Letter tu/vous	0.50	1	0.39	2	0.60	5	0.13	1	0.75	1	0.52	10
Communicative strategies (max=2)	1.38	1	1.68	2	1.57	5	2.0	1	1.75	1	1.63	10

Table 32

Grade 9 Late Immersion District Results (based on class means)

Measure	District A $\bar{X}$	A N	D $\bar{X}$	D N	E $\bar{X}$	E N	H $\bar{X}$	H N	All $\bar{X}$	All N
IQ	101.65	1	111.35	1	113.00	1	108.80	6	108.75	9
Listening (max-22)	11.00	1	9.13	1	11.78	1	10.09	6	10.28	9
Reading (max=58)	27.20	1	25.68	1	34.26	1	25.64	6	26.78	9
SPEAKING AND WRITING										
No. of sophisticated verbs	1.13	1	2.50	1	1.00	1	0.80	6	1.05	9
No. of preposition errors	1.63	1	1.00	1	0.25	1	0.51	6	0.66	9
No. of grammatical spelling errors	3.25	1	2.63	1	1.90	1	2.33	6	2.42	9
Pronunciation (max=3)	1.63	1	2.13	1	1.75	1	1.98	6	1.93	9
No. of tasks fulfilled (max=5)	3.00	1	3.75	1	3.13	1	3.83	6	3.65	9
% of tense errors (written)	13.75	1	3.75	1	6.25	1	9.17	6	8.75	9
% of tense errors (oral)	9.72	1	5.00	1	15.88	1	12.16	6	11.51	9
Note opening	0.38	1	0.63	1	0.50	1	0.47	6	0.48	9
Note tu/vous	0.50	1	0.50	1	0.50	1	0.79	6	0.69	9
Letter opening	1.00	1	1.00	1	1.00	1	0.88	6	0.92	9
Letter tu/vous	0.63	1	0.50	1	0.40	1	0.46	6	0.48	9
Communicative strategies (max=2)	1.38	1	1.63	1	1.43	1	1.49	6	1.48	9

Table 33

Grade 9 District Rank Orders[a]

Measure	Early Immersion Districts					Late Immersion Districts			
	F	G	H	J	K	A	D	E	H
IQ	5	1	3	2	4	4	2	1	3
Listening	1	2	3	4	5	2	4	1	3
Reading	3	4	5	1	2	2	3	1	4
Sophisticated verbs	4	1	3	2	5	2	1	3	4
Preposition errors	2	1	3	5	4	4	3	1	2
Grammatical spelling errors	4	1	3	5	2	4	3	1	2
Pronunciation	4	5	3	1	2	4	1	3	2
Tasks fulfilled	4	2	3	4	1	4	2	3	1
Tense errors (written)	3	1	2	4	5	4	1	2	3
Tense errors (oral)	5	4	3	2	1	2	1	4	3
Note opening	2	1	4	5	2	4	1	2	3
Note tu/vous	1	5	2	3	3	2	2	2	1
Letter opening	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	4
Letter tu/vous	3	4	2	5	1	1	2	4	3
Communicative strategies	5	3	4	1	2	4	1	3	2

[a]A rank of "1" = best performance; "5" (early immersion) or "4" (late immersion) = worst performance

Table 34

Questionnaire Returns

Grade Level	Number Sent	Number Returned
3	17	13 (76%)
6	15	12 (80%)
9	18	15 (83%)

Total Number Sent: 50
Total Number Returned: 40
Total Percentage Returned: 80%

Table 35

Teaching Experience
(Including 1982-83)

	Average Number of Years Teaching	Minimum Number of Years Teaching	Maximum Number of Years Teaching	Average Number of Years Teaching French Immersion or Intensive French
Grade 3 (n=13)	6.77	2	13	5.15
Grade 6 (n=12)	6.33	1	14	3
Grade 9 (n=15)	10.8	3	25	2.2

Table 36

Courses Taken During Teacher Certification
Related to the Teaching of French
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
French Immersion	62	17	33
French as a Second Language	38	58	80
French Mother Tongue	69	83	73

Table 37

Teacher Satisfaction with Type of Training
as Preparation for Teaching Immersion
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Very Adequate	15	17	27
Adequate	69	50	7
Somewhat Adequate	15	17	33
Not Adequate	-	-	20

Table 38

Teacher Satisfaction with Amount of Training
as Preparation for Teaching Immersion
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Very Adequate	-	-	-
Adequate	62	67	40
Somewhat Adequate	31	17	20
Not Adequate	8	8	27

Table 39

In-Service and Summer Courses
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
French Language Arts, reading summer program	15	17	33
French as a Second Language, summer program	15	33	67
French as a Second Language, in-service	-	-	27
French Immersion Techniques, summer program	77	25	33
French Immersion Techniques, in-service	15	8	13

Table 40

Opportunities for In-Service Training
(Percentage Response)

Do you have adequate opportunities for in-service training in areas in which you want to develop further?

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Yes	69	83	67
No	23	8	33

Table 41

How Well French is Spoken by Teacher
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Native Speaker	69	67	87
Like a Native Speaker	8	-	-
Quite Well	23	33	13

Table 42

Teachers with French Used as Medium
of Instruction During Schooling
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Elementary	100	92	80
Secondary	100	92	73
University	77	83	80

Table 43

Language Mainly Used at Home by Teachers
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
French	62	50	73
English	23	8	13
Both	15	42	13
Other Language	-	-	-

Table 44

Academic Ability of Immersion Students
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Above Average	38	25	20
Average	54	50	60
Below Average	-	8	-
Mixed	8	17	20

Table 45

Socio-Economic Level of Immersion Students
in the School
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Upper Middle	8	8	20
Middle	38	83	47
Lower Middle	15	8	13
Working	8	-	20
Mixed	31	-	-

Table 46

Student Transfers from Immersion Program this Year
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
0	92	67	47
1-2	-	33	20
3-4	8	-	20
5 or more	-	-	13

Table 47

Reasons French Immersion Students Transfer
out of the Immersion Program
(Percentage Response)

Reason	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9	Total of Three Grade Levels
Family moves	62	67	47	58
Student has diagnosed learning disability	62	58	40	53
Student not achieving well in French (comprehension)	38	50	47	45
Student not achieving well in French (language fluency)	38	25	53	40
Parental concern about the child's academic achievement	15	58	40	38
Limited or inadequate available French remedial service	38	17	13	23
Perceived lack of ability by parents or teachers of the child to cope with learning a second language	31	8	27	23
Loss of parental confidence in the choice of program	38	8	13	20
Student unhappy with pressure at school	31	8	13	18
Peer influence	8	17	20	18
School recommendation to parents	15	17	20	18
Student not achieving in academic areas (other than math)	15	0	13	15
Parental stress	15	8	13	13
Student has behavioural problems	0	0	27	10
Student not achieving well in English	0	0	13	5
Degree of parental competence in French	0	8	7	5
Student not achieving in mathematics	0	8	0	3
Student has speech difficulty (e.g. stuttering)	0	0	0	0

Table 48

Sufficient French in the Program
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Yes	54	92	53
No	38	8	47

Table 49

Sufficient English in the Program
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Yes	100	100	93
No	-	-	-

Table 50

Amount of Material Displayed that is French or French Oriented
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
In the Classroom			
90-100%	77	50	53
50-89%	8	50	13
Less than 50%	8	-	20
In the School Corridors			
75-100%	46	25	-
50-74%	-	25	7
Less than 50%	38	42	67

Table 51

How often Various School Activities Occur in French
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
School Assemblies			
Never	85	100	100
1%-49% of the Time	8	-	-
50%-100% of the Time	8	-	-
School Activities (e.g. sports days)			
Never	54	50	100
1%-49% of the Time	-	17	-
50%-100% of the Time	31	17	-
P.A. Announcements			
Never	92	92	93
1%-49% of the Time	-	-	-
50%-100% of the Time	8	8	7

Table 52

Students' Use of French in School
(Percentage Response)

Give your general impression of your pupils' communication in French in the following contexts. Do your pupils generally speak French	Not at all	Some-times	Often/ always	No opinion
to you in lessons taught in French	-	-	93	7
to you otherwise in the classroom	-	-	93	7
to you outside the classroom around the school	-	10	83	7
to other teachers during lessons taught in French	-	10	70	20
to other pupils during lessons taught in French	-	30	63	7
to other pupils otherwise in the classroom	5	40	53	2
to their own classmates outside the classroom	40	45	15	-
to other pupils in the school	55	33	13	-
to other members of the school staff?	15	48	38	-

Table 53

Students' French Activities Outside of School*
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
A Lot	8	-	-
A Little	54	25	47
Not At All	15	17	13
Differs from Student to Student	54	58	47

*Instructed to indicate more than one response if appropriate- this is why numbers total more than 100%.

Table 54

Influence of School Experiences on Students' Attitudes to Francophones
(Percentage Response)

Do you think that your students' school experiences have influenced their attitudes to Francophones?

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Yes, positively	77	83	93
Yes, negatively	-	-	-
No	15	8	7

Table 55

Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Immersion Program
(Percentage Response)

Generally, how satisfied/dissatisfied are you with the following aspects of the French Immersion program?	Extremely Satisfied	Satisfied	No Particular Issue	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Quite Unsatisfied
Development of English competence	20	48	18	3	3
Development of competence in French	25	53	3	18	0
Development in subject areas other than language (note any particular subject)	18	38	20	8	3
Aids in social relations between groups (e.g., understanding French culture and people)	10	50	13	23	0
Opportunities for individual attention, instruction related to child's needs or interests	5	25	10	33	18
Attitude of child (children) to program and school	15	55	8	13	5
Adequacy of facilities - e.g., library, resources	8	35	18	28	10
Communications with home	23	55	15	5	0
Reporting of student progress/achievement	10	68	13	5	0
Quality, frequency of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities	10	43	18	18	5
Program balance (English and French)	18	25	13	25	10
Opportunities for encouragement of extension of use of French beyond the school	0	13	0	45	40
Quality of texts and resources for program given in French	10	48	5	25	10
Continuity of curriculum	15	45	0	23	13

Table 56

Emphasis on Oral French
(Percentage Response)

Do you think that the immersion program in your school district should place more emphasis on conversation and oral comprehension?	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Yes	38	42	60
Probably	23	17	27
Neutral	23	17	13
Probably Not	-	8	-
No	8	8	-

Table 57

Emphasis on Grammar and Reading
(Percentage Response)

Do you think that the immersion program in your school district should place more emphasis on grammar and reading?	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Yes	15	0	20
Probably	31	33	27
Neutral	31	17	27
Probably Not	8	25	13
No	8	17	13

Table 58

Assessments of Basic Subject Programs and/or Materials Available in Subjects
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
French Language Arts*			
Adequate and Suitable	77	100	73
Not Enough and/or Not Suitable	15	-	27
Mathematics			
Adequate and Suitable	85	92	47
Not Enough and/or Not Suitable	8	8	13
Science			
Adequate and Suitable	62	25	40
Not Enough and/or Not Suitable	23	67	13
Social Science			
Adequate and Suitable	54	42	53
Not Enough and/or Not Suitable	31	50	20

*Many grade 9 teachers did not respond to some parts of this question.

Table 59

Assessments of the Back-Up Resources Available
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Films, Filmstrips etc.			
Adequate and Suitable	15	42	33
Not Enough and/or Not Suitable	77	42	53
Records and Tapes			
Adequate and Suitable	85	50	33
Not Enough and/or Not Suitable	8	42	47
Radio and TV Broadcasts			
Adequate and Suitable	8	-	33
Not Enough and/or Not Suitable	62	92	53
Posters and Other Visuals			
Adequate and Suitable	62	50	47
Not Enough and/or Not Suitable	15	50	33
Field Trip Locations			
Adequate and Suitable	54	50	33
Not Enough and/or Not Suitable	23	33	40
Supplementary Books for Students			
Adequate and Suitable	54	67	47
Not Enough and/or Not Suitable	31	25	40

Table 60

Satisfaction with Program in
Specific Areas
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Course Content			
Very Satisfied	62	25	13
Satisfied	38	67	60
Somewhat Satisfied	-	8	7
Unsatisfied	-	-	13
Instructional Materials			
Very Satisfied	31	8	13
Satisfied	38	50	60
Somewhat Satisfied	23	33	7
Unsatisfied	8	8	13
Teaching Methods			
Very Satisfied	38	17	27
Satisfied	38	83	53
Somewhat Satisfied	8	-	7
Unsatisfied	15	-	-
Testing Student Peformance			
Very Satisfied	31	17	13
Satisfied	46	50	47
Somewhat Satisfied	15	25	33
Unsatisfied	8	8	-
Units of Studies (program)			
Very Satisfied	46	17	13
Satisfied	46	58	47
Somewhat Satisfied	-	8	33
Unsatisfied	-	-	-

Table 61

Importance of the French Consultant
(Percentage Response)
n=40

How important do you believe a French language consultant can be to your immersion program?

No Importance	0
Slight Importance	3
Important	28
Very Important	28
Extremely Important	40

Table 62

Support from Principal
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9	Total
Very Supportive	31	50	60	48
Fairly Supportive	46	-	13	20
Somewhat Supportive	8	25	20	18
Neutral	-	25	-	8
No Support	-	-	7	3

Table 63

Support from Non-Immersion Teachers
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Very Supportive	8	-	7
Fairly Supportive	38	8	33
Somewhat Supportive	46	75	13
Neutral	-	17	7
No Support	-	-	33

Table 64

Adequacy of Remedial Facilities to Students' Needs
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Yes	23	42	53
No	54	33	47

Table 65

Teachers' Perceptions of Parent Satisfaction with the Program
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Very Satisfied	77	75	73
Moderately Satisfied	8	13	27
A Few Complaints	-	8	-
Many Complaints	-	-	-

Table 66

Kinds of Concerns Immersion Parents Express
(Percentage Response)

	Grade 3	Grade 6	Grade 9
Too much French in the program	-	-	-
Too much English in the program	-	8	20
Materials aren't good enough	8	8	7
Extra support facilities (remedial etc.) not good enough	15	17	7
Scheduling problems	8	25	-
Bussing problems	-	25	-
Can't help children with homework	85	92	87
Children aren't achieving enough in regular subjects	-	8	20

Table 67

Grade 3 Teacher Responses to Homework in the Early Grades
(Percentage Response)

Do you believe children in French immersion programs have sufficient knowledge of French to handle homework in the early grades (e.g. first three years)?	
This presents no problem	54
Is somewhat of a problem	31
Is the same as regular classes	15